

Bible *Complutensian* *175*
AN *Complutensian*
ENQUIRY *689.6.22*
5

INTO THE

AUTHORITY

OF THE

Primitive *Complutensian* Edition of
the NEW TESTAMENT,

As principally founded on the most An-
cient *Vatican* Manuscript; together with some
Research after that Manuscript. In order to
decide the DISPUTE about 1 *John* v. 7.

In a LETTER to the Reverend Mr.
Archdeacon BENTLEY, Master of *Trinity*-
College in *Cambridge*. *Edw. R. Mearns*



L O N D O N,

Printed for *John Nicks* at the *White Hart* in
St. Paul's Church-Yard. 1722.

U-1-0741

PROPERTY

REF ID:

THE MATTER WAS

the manuscript found on the road. As
the manuscript was found together with some
other manuscripts, in order to
preserve the manuscript, it was
found that the manuscript was about 1700.

...to the ...
...of ...
...the ...

MOON

at Paul's Church-Yard, 1722.



MS. that relate to the disputed text
in the 5th Chap. of the 1st Epistle of
St. John, towards **A**ccording the Autho-
rity of which these Papers are now
off'd to me in Connection of your Let-
ter which is hereby Certifi'd as being

Time that this celebrated Passage should
be examin'd with the most Accuracy,
that either its Authority may be satis-

Rev. Mr. Archdeacon BENTLEY,
Master of Trinity College, in Cam-
bridge.

Rev. S I R,

H A T Regard is paid by
the Learned World to
your superiour Skill in
Critical Enquiries, that I
cannot think it improper
to address the following
Essay to a Person of your acknowledg'd
Sagacity, in order to receive a just So-
lution of the Question propos'd. And
indeed I am particularly determin'd to
give

give you the Trouble of this Application, by your having lately publish'd your Design to give us the *New Testament* as review'd by your self, and consequently to oblige the World with an Examination of both *Greek and Latin MSS.* that relate to the disputed Text in the 5th Chap. of the 1st Epist. of *St. John*; towards deciding the Authority of which, these Papers are now offer'd to the Consideration of your self and the Publick. Certainly it is high Time that this celebrated Passage should be examin'd with the greatest Accuracy, that either its Authority may be satisfactorily vindicated, or be fairly given up for an Interpolation, if it is not capable of being defended. The Church has been of late so rudely insulted for retaining it in the *English Translation* of *St. John's* first Epistle, and the Memory of your ancient Friend, the late faithful and learned *Reviser* of the *New Testament*, has been reflected on so severely for deciding in Favour of it, that it may seem surprizing to some, that it has been on that Occasion been so warmly in Vindication of it, than what has been offer'd by the ingenious *Mr. Marston*, in his Controversy with *Mr. Eshel*. But

Of this I have now added, that a Copious Vindication of this Text has been very lately Publish'd, in four Sermons, by Dr. E. Calamy.

But since this is a Text that has been frequently cited in Controversy against the Unitarians and others, as a Passage of Scripture that most expressly asserts Three Persons in the Divine Nature; and since both the * Greek and Latin Churches now read this Passage, and have done so for many Ages, in a very solemn Manner; and since in particular the Church of England has in her Liturgy appointed the reading of this Passage as Part of one of the Lessons on Trinity-Sunday, and has likewise ever since the Reformation prescribed the publick Reading of it in one of her Epistolary Sections, namely, that on

John 1. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.

* Certè in Ritibus Ecclesie Græcorum Orientalis, velut ab antiquis seculis, recepta est ejusdem [sc. v. 7. c. 5. i. Epist. S. Johannis.] in Epistola illa lectio publica quotannis in quinta feria Hebdomadis a Pascha trigesima quintæ, ut liquet ex eorum Codice cui Titulus Αποστολῶν. Vid. Selden. de Synedr. 1. 2. c. 4. In Lectionibus Dominicæ in Albis, seu Dominicæ Pascha proximæ sequentis, reliquisq; usq; ad Festum Ascensionis, solenne fuit antiquitus ut hodieq; pro Epistola Diei inter alias propria legere partem Capitis jam dictæ Johannis Epistolæ quintæ, atq; in lectione illa publica & recapitulatissima velut omnino genuinum agnosci jam dictum Commat. [sc. 7. cap. 5.] Ibid.

Sub Henrico Octavo, in Epistola post Reformationem, sc. inceptam Solennibus, & sub Edwardo Sexto in Liturgia Anglicana Publica, ut postmodum similiter perpetuo sub Elizabetha Regina demincepsq; legabatur [hæc Comma] ut alibi, ut pars Capitis quintæ Epistolæ primæ Johannis, Dominicæ proximæ Pascha sequentis propriæ. Ibid. p. 128 & 139. Lond. 1653.

the first *Sunday* after *Easter*, according to ancient Custom; since, I say, some Stress seems to have been laid upon this Passage; in Honour and Decency, and out of a just Regard to what has been so long reputed Part of the Word of God, its Authority ought to be examin'd with the most mature Deliberation, before it be either tacitly or avowedly given up as an Indefensible Passage. It is not easy indeed to add any thing considerable to what has already been laid before the Publick about the Quotation of this Passage by *St. Cyprian*, or the suppos'd Allusion to it by *Tertullian*, together with the Methods that have been made use of to elude those Authorities; and therefore I shall not here enter into an Enquiry whether *St. Cyprian* directly quoted this Passage, as *Fulgentius* seems to affirm, or whether he mention'd it only as a Mystical Interpretation of the 8th Verse, as *Facundus* tells us; tho' *Facundus* liv'd too remotely from the Age of *St. Cyprian*, to know with certainty, that what *St. Cyprian* seems to quote literally out of Scripture, was design'd by him merely for a mystical Interpretation of another Passage. Neither shall I now examine, whether *Tertullian* alluded to the controverted Passage, or spoke

spoke his own Sense without any Allusion. These Matters have been so expatiated upon by our late Writers, who on one Side have copy'd chiefly after *F. Simon*, that instead of repeating what is so well known, I rather choose to lay before the Publick another Part of this Argument, that has not been so thoroughly discussed as it deserves. And it is taken from the Authority of the *Complutensian* Edition of the *Greek Testament*, which (as is well known) was not only the first, but the most accurate Edition of it, and which in Fact inserted the disputed Passage of the threefold Testimony in Heaven. An Edition this, that was firmly believ'd by the subsequent Editors of the *New Testament* to have been entirely founded on the most ancient MSS. as will appear in its proper Place. The Question then is, upon what Authority the *Complutensian* Editors inserted this famous Passage of *St. John*, and particularly whether they did insert it upon the Authority of the most ancient *Vatican* MS. or MSS. This is a Question of great Importance to this Text, since the *British Greek* MS. cited by *Erasmus* in Favour of this Text, and consulted by himself, is perish'd, or not now to be found; since likewise *Robert Stephens's* *Greek*

Greek MSS. that have long been believ'd to have had this Text, are either lost, or endeavour'd to be render'd Dubious; tho' *Beza* * confirm'd their Authority, by declaring that he review'd them himself; and tho' they have lately been vindicated with great Strength against the new Artifices of *F. Le Long* †. And since also the Authority of this Passage in the noble Edition of *Complutum* or *Alcala*, as being pretended to have been founded on no *Greek MS.* at all, is much disputed. Since therefore it has been roundly asserted that this Text is not to be found in any ancient *Greek MS.* and since it must be confess'd that we are reduc'd into a narrow Compass with regard to *Greek MSS.* it may not be unserviceable to endeavour to clear up the Authority of the *Complutensian* Edition of the *Greek Testament*, and of this disputed Text in particular, as founded on a very ancient *MS.* or *MSS.* And that it was so founded, I hope to evince in the following Method.

First, I shall shew, that the *Complutensian Greek Testament*, as soon as it appear'd in the World, was of that Authority, as to oblige *Erasmus*, *Robert* Stephens,

* Vid. Praefat. & Epist. Dedic. N. T.

† Vid. Martin's Genuineness of this Text, p. 62.

Stephens, and the other subsequent Editors of the New Testament, to accommodate their Text very much to that Edition.

Tho' the Complutensian Greek Testament was really the first that ever was Printed, yet since (by some accidental Obstructions) † it lay Concealed and Unpublished for several Years after it was finished, Erasmus did in Fact publish Three Editions of the Greek Testament before the Complutensian Edition saw the Light, and was known to the learned World. For the Complutensian Edition of the Greek Testament was finished in 1514, but that Testament was not Published, till about 1525. Before which time, namely, in 1522, Erasmus published his Third Edition of the Greek Testament. But Erasmus in his Fourth Edition of it, namely, in 1527, ‖ professed his Agreement with the Complutensian Text of the New Testament, took many various Readings out of the same, and in many Places alter'd his former Text, by taking into the room of it the Readings of that excellent Spanish Edition, that had by that time gained the highest

B

Repu-

† Vid. Millii Proleg. p. 109. Edit. Oxon. Vid. Atv. Gomecium de reb. gest. Ximenii, lib. 2. p. 966. apud A. Schotti Hispan. illustrat. Francof. 1603. 1. Vol. Fol.
 ‖ Vid. Millii Proleg. p. 114.

Reputation and Authority. And † as for his Fifth and last Edition, he made very little Alteration in it from that which immediately preceded it, that is, at the Distance of eight Years, and just before his Death. So that he continued his great Esteem for the *Complutensian* Edition as long as he lived. And more especially with Application to the disputed Verse in *St. John*, whereas it has been said by several Writers that *Erasmus* put that Verse into the Text of his New Testament, merely on the Authority of the *Codex Britannicus*, and to prevent Calumny; it is observable, that this was spoke by *Erasmus* only of his *Third* Edition of the New Testament, in which he inserted that disputed Verse after he had omitted it in his two former Editions; for he seems to have been confirmed in the Genuineness of that Verse, since he * continued it in his Fourth and Fifth Editions of the New Testament, that is, after he had seen it in the *Complutensian* Edition, to which he paid a great Respect, and very much accommodated both those Editions.

Next to *Erasmus's* Editions of the New Testament, those of *Robert Stephens* made the

† Vid. Millii Prolegom. p. 116.

* Vid. Millii Prolegom. p. 114.

the greatest Figure. And we have particular reason to mention these, because our Present Text of the New Testament is the same with his. Now we are assured by Dr. Mill, || that Robert Stephens founded the Text of his New Testament upon the *Complutensian* Edition as the Basis of his Work; and likewise that upon Collation of Greek MSS. in the French King's Library, he judged those MSS. the best that most agreed with the *Complutensian* Edition; which he preferred to *Erasmus's* Fifth and last. This was his *Criterion*, and this his Method throughout his first Edition of the New Testament in 1646; with which his following ones agreed, with regard to the controverted Verse. And as for his second Edition of the New Testament in 1549, he added more Readings out of the *Complutensian* Testament to what he had extracted thence in his former Edition.*

And with regard to Robert Stephens's Third and most Celebrated Edition in 1550, in *Folio*, Dr. Mill computes that there are 598 Readings in it taken out of the *Complutensian* Edition. And he assures us, that R. Stephens had that Value

B 2

for

|| Vid. Millii Prolegom. p. 116, 117, 119, 120.

* Ibid. p. 125.

for it, and paid that Regard to its Authority, that in this his best Edition he resumed several Readings out of the *Complutensian* Testament, which he had before rejected; and this in opposition to all other Editions then extant: Of which we have many eminent Instances in the *Apocalypse*.†

As for other Editors of lesser Character, 'tis clear from Dr. Mill's Collection that most of them paid that Deference to the *Complutensian* Edition as to accommodate their Editions of the New Testament to it, yet it would be superfluous to mention them in particular, after what has been asserted of those superiour Editors *Erasmus* and *Robert Stephens*, who have been chiefly copied after by the subsequent Editors.

Secondly, The Reason of this Authority of the *Complutensian* Edition was founded on the most ancient *Vatican* MSS. and particularly on that excellent *Vatican* MS. which was recommended, or rather prescribed, to the *Complutensian* Editors as the Ground-work of their Edition of the New Testament.

It is so well known that the *Complutensian* New Testament was carried on at the

† Vid. Millii Prolegom. p. 126.

the vast Expense of that munificent Patron of Learning, Cardinal *Jimenes*, Archbishop of *Toledo*, just before the Reformation began, that I shall not here enlarge upon it: But shall only take notice that that great Man was supplied with *Greek MSS.* of the New Testament out of the *Vatican Library*; by Order of Pope *Leo X.* for his Assistance on that Occasion; as we are assured from the Preface to the *Complutensian New Testament*, in which the learned Men employ'd as Editors under the Cardinal acquaint us, that the said *Greek Testament* was formed upon several most ancient and most correct *MSS.* But that it principally was transcribed from one particular *Vatican MS.* of great Character for its extraordinary Antiquity and Correctness, appears, says *Dr. Mill*,* from the Acknowledgment of those Editors, but (I think) more evidently from *Erasmus's* † Sense of that Matter. It was this *MS.* from which Pope *Leo* commanded those Editors not to depart, but

ent tati oldsdorg yldgini ai I. thid To
-ortio. Complutensian Editors found the Contro-

verted Passage of St. John in the Vatican

* Vid. Prolegom. p. 108.
† Quibus [sc. Hispanis Editoribus] in Prolipsis ad-
vitate Exemplar eximia vetustatis spectataque fidei exhibitum
e Bibliotheca Vaticana, a quo jussi sunt non recedere. Apud
Erasmi Epistol. ad Rob. Aldrisum, p. 1249. Edit. Lond.
Vid. etiam *Erasmi Cap. Argument. cont. moros. prefix.*
5ta Edit. N. T. Bas. 1535.

to adhere to it as the Ground-work and Text of their Greek Testament. Of all which since Dr. Mill has given a very copious Account, I rather chuse to refer to it than Transcribe it. || It is sufficient under this Head to observe, that the great Authority which the *Complutensian* Edition of the New Testament soon obtained among the Learned must have been founded on the *Vatican* MSS. and more especially on that distinguished MS. which had the Honour to be prescribed by the Pope himself as the Text of that Edition; since I do not find that any more Greek MSS. than those of the *Vatican* were collated by the *Complutensian* Editors, except the *Rhodian* one of the *Acts* and *Epistles*, (cited often by *Stunica*) and except the *Codex Britannicus*, (mentioned by *Erasmus*) which the late Bishop *Stillingfleet* * assures us was sent to *Rome* on this Occasion; tho' I confess I know not upon what Authority this is asserted by that very learned Person.

Thirdly, It is highly probable that the *Complutensian* Editors found the Controverted Passage of St. John in the *Vatican* MS. recommended particularly by Pope

Leo,
 multiplex hunc scripturam...
 Aug. A. ... non tam recte...
 ...
 Vid. etiam ... Cap. Argument. cont. ...

|| Vid. Proleg. p. 108, 109.

• Vid. Vindication of Trinity, p. 126.

Leo, and therefore inserted it in their Edition of the New Testament. And that for the following Reasons.

First, Pope *Leo* (as has been just now shewn) expressly commanded Cardinal *Ximenes* and the learned Men employed by him in the *Complutensian* Edition of the New Testament, not to vary from the *Vatican* MS. that he recommended to them. Now it cannot easily be imagined but that this Command of the supreme Head of their Church should have had great Weight with and Influence on them; and that not only when we consider those Editors for the most Part as *Spaniards*, that is, as Men most strongly attached to the Obedience of the Papal Chair, but more especially as engaged in a Work of so nice a Nature, as the giving the *first* Printed Edition of the *Greek* Testament, the great Rule of Faith and Manners, to the Christian World, and that from a certain Copy prescribed them as their unvaried Text by no less a Person than the supposed Vicar of Christ upon Earth. When these Circumstances, I say, are consider'd, it is by no means credible that those Editors should incur the Imputation of corrupting the Word of God, or run the greater Hazard of being disobedient to the Pope's express Command on so solemn an Occasion.

Second-

Secondly, The *Complutensian* Editors themselves affirm (as has been already intimated from † Dr. Mill) that they formed their Edition of the New Testament principally upon one particular *Vatican* MS. Tho' he does not pretend that they did entirely do so in Exclusion of all the other MSS. sent by Pope Leo, he asserts, * that in effect they transcribed that MS. into their Edition. It is confessed indeed by the Editors in their Preface, that they were supplied with several ancient MSS. in order to perfect their Edition of the New Testament; yet since the chief Stress was by Pope Leo's Command to be laid upon one particular MS. it is reasonable to think that tho' they might in some few Places vary from it upon the Credit of the other MSS. yet that they would not do so with regard to our Text in *St. John*, since it had been long read in both Eastern and Western Churches, and was known to be applied to so important a Doctrine as that of the Trinity.

Thirdly, The Singular Readings of this Text (as well as of many others) in the *Complutensian*

† Quod (sic Editionem) ad hanc [sic] Cod. MS. Vaticanum] maxime expressam aiant. [sic] Complutensia.] Vid. Mill. Proleg. p. 108.
* Ibid.

Complutensian Edition of the New Testament shew that they were taken from the *Vatican* MS. so particularly recommended to the Editors as their Standard. For as Dr. Mill judiciously observes, those Readings are not now to be met with in the other MSS. of the New Testament. And it is peculiar to this disputed Passage in the *Complutensian* Edition, that at the end of the 7th Verse it is read of the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, *Kαὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσι.* All other Copies that we have heard of, that have the 7th Verse, read it, *Kαὶ οἱ τρεῖς ἕν ἐστι.* In the *Complutensian* Edition, the Words, *Kαὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσι,* are omitted at the end of the 8th Verse. But this Omission, tho' disagreeable to the Common Reading, is not peculiar to that Edition: For the *Codex Britannicus*, and some other Copies, have likewise omitted it. In the *Complutensian* Edition it is read, *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι;* whereas in the other Copies it is read, *ἐν τῇ γῇ.* Now since the *Complutensian* Editors had, according to Dr. Mill, no other Greek Copies of the New Testament, † but the *Vatican* MSS. the *Rhodian* MS. and (perhaps) the *British* MS. those Singular Readings of their Text must

† Vid. Mill. Prolegom. p. 108.

must have been derived (if from any MS) from one or other of these. It has been just now shewn, that the 7th Verse was read otherwise in the *Codex Britannicus*. And *Stunica* (who in his Dispute with *Erasmus* frequently cites the *Rhodian* MS. on other Occasions) does not quote that MS. in favour of this Text of *St. John* when omitted by *Erasmus*. It must therefore have been (if in any) in one or other of the *Vatican* MSS. And in which could it have been so probably, as in that distinguish'd MS. from which the Pope expressly commanded them not to recede? Not to mention what is so frequently insisted on against this Text by our Adversaries, but really turns in favour of it; namely, that this Text was not found in any of the *Vatican* MSS. by *Caryophilus* in the Review of *Urban VIII*. Whence it follows, that if those *Vatican* MSS. were some of the MSS. that were formerly sent to *Ximenes*, (as is the common Opinion) and if this Text was taken from a certain *Vatican* MS. it must have been so from some other *Vatican* MS. that was not Collated by *Caryophilus*; and therefore most probably from that *Vatican* MS. which was enjoined by Pope *Leo* to be the Standard of the *Complutensian* Edition. And that more especially, since

since the many Singular Readings in the *Complutensian* Edition, as well as those of this disputed Text, are not in the *Vatican* MSS. that were examined by *Caryophilus*, nor indeed in any other MSS. that are now extant, as far as we have heard. And therefore as it is not doubted that the many other Singular Readings in that Primitive Edition were taken from some or other of the *Vatican* MSS. there is as little Reason to doubt that this Singular Text in *St. John* was likewise taken from some or other of the same MSS. If the other Singular Readings are allow'd to be genuine, this Singular Reading ought also to be so allow'd. For MSS. can now no more be produced for the one than the other. And if the many other Singular Readings are not allow'd to be genuine, the *Complutensian* Edition of the New Testament, which has always been highly valued by all competent Judges, must be given up as of no Authority.

If it be said on this Occasion, || *that an unprejudiced Reader would presently guess from the marginal Note in the very Complutensian Edition it self, that the Editors put in this Text [i. e. 7th Verse]*

C 2

upon

upon the Authority of St. Thomas Aquinas, who knew no Greek, and not from their Vatican MSS. To this it may be Replied, that the contrary is very evident from the said marginal Note. * For from thence it by no means follows that the Complutensian Editors made any Alteration in the 7th Verse; but that if they made any at all, it was in the 8th Verse; namely, that in the 8th they omitted these Words, *Kai oi tres in aor.* after the Testimony of the Spirit, Water and Blood. For the Argument against Abbot Joachim, as mentioned in the marginal Note, turns upon these Words, with relation only to the Three Witnesses on Earth, and cannot possibly be applied to the three Witnesses in Heaven. But, however, it does not follow, that even these Words

* Sanctus Thomas in Expositione secunda Decretalis de summa Trinitate & fide Catholica tractant istum passum contra Abbatem Joachim, vid. Tres sunt qui Testimonium dant in Cælo, Pater, Verbum, & Spiritus Sanctus; dicit ad literam verba sequentia. Et ad insinuandam Unitatem trium Personarum subditur, & hi tres unum sunt. Quod quidem dicitur propter Essentie Unitatem: Sed hoc Joachim perverse trahere volens ad Unitatem Charitatis & Consensus inducebat consequentem auctoritatem. Nam subditur ibidem; & tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terra, sc. Spiritus, Aqua, & Sanguis. Et in quibusdam libris additur: & hi tres Unum sunt. Sed hoc in veris Exemplaribus non habetur; sed dicitur esse appositum ab Hæreticis Arianis ad pervertendum intellectum sanum Auctoritatis præmissæ de Unitate Essentie trium Personarum. He: Beatus Thomas ubi supra. Not. ad 5tum Cap. 1mæ Epist. S. Johannis in Complutens. Edit.

in the 8th Verse were omitted on the Account of *Aquinas*; since they were not in the *Codex Britannicus*, said to have been consulted by the *Complutensian* Editors; and therefore might be omitted on the Authority of that MS. as well as of the *Vatican* MS. || And indeed several great Men, upon the Authority of ancient Copies, have been of Opinion, that this Passage in the 8th Verse ought to be omitted; and have probably supposed that it was inserted with design to derogate from the Belief of the essential Unity of the Three Heavenly Witnesses. The Conjecture then of the 7th Verse having been inserted in the *Complutensian* Edition from *Aquinas*, is not only ill-grounded and unconvulsive, but is attended with some fatal Consequences. For such a Supposition would render the Authority of the first Editors of the *Greek* Testament so very precarious, as to derogate from the Authority of their great Work it self, with regard to all those Singular Readings that occur in it, and (as has been shewn) are on the same Foot with this Singular Reading in St.

|| Et quidem in MSS. Exemplaribus multis Latinis Græcisque, etiam in Editionibus aliquot Græcis, &c. omittitur illud de Unitate Spiritus, Aquæ, & Sanguinis. Viri aliquot magni Vetus Exemplarium Autoritate ducti verbis illis locum ibi debere nolunt. *Vid. Selden. de Synedr. l. 2. c. 4. p. 141.*

St. *John*. And if so, the subsequent Editions that have been copied after the *Complutensian* Testament, and have retained many of its Singular Readings, will suffer some Diminution of Authority. For if it were allow'd that the *Complutensian* Editors could have taken the Liberty of inserting a spurious Text merely from *Aquinas*, and without Regard and indeed in Opposition to the *Vatican* MS. prescribed them by Pope *Leo* as the Standard of their Edition; it must be granted that they deserve to be censured as wicked Impostors, that could have practised so great a piece of Prevarication; and by so notorious a Cheat on the Christian World, must have sunk for ever not only their own Reputation, but that of their Edition of the New Testament. All which is contrary to the Judgment of the learned World, both with regard to *Ximenes* and his Assistants, who have been so universally celebrated, and likewise with regard to their Edition it self, which has been so justly valued and copied after by the subsequent Editors of the New Testament. And surely the Sense of so many learned Persons, who have allow'd that the Text of the *Complutensian* Edition of the New Testament was entirely formed upon ancient MSS. is of great Weight

Weight against some late Suspicions of Falsification.

Fourthly, It appears from several Passages of *Erasmus*, that, as much as he doubted of the disputed Text in *St. John*, he doubted not but that the *Complutensian* Testament was taken from the ancient *Vatican* MS. and that in particular this controverted Text was taken out of it. For he not only assures us, (as has been been shewn before under the second Head) that the † *Complutensian* Editors were commanded by Pope *Leo* to adhere without Variation to that most ancient and correct Copy that was sent them out of the *Vatican* Library by his Authority; but he farther declares in his Fourth Edition of the New Testament (which was the *first* after the Publication of the *Complutensian* Testament) that he almost entirely agreed with the *Complutensian* Greek Text, which || *Ximenes* had taken from the *Vatican* Copy that Pope *Leo* had supplied him with. And in his Fifth and last Edition of the New Testament, *Erasmus* says in general, that those Editors followed the said *Vatican* Copy. *

But

† Vid. p. 13. in Margin.

|| Vid. Mill. Prolegom. p. 114.

* Vid. Cap. Argument. prefix. Edit. 5ta [apud Mill. Prolegom. p. 108.]

But above all, *Erasmus* acquaints us more fully in his *Annotations* on this very Text, * that it was his Opinion that the *Spanish* Editors followed the *Vatican* Copy when they inserted this Verse of *St. John*. And surely the Judgment of so great a Critick as *Erasmus*, consider'd as Contemporary with the *Complutensian* Editors, and likewise as the very First Person that rais'd Scruples about the Genuineness of this Verse, is of so great Weight, as to be almost Decisive in the present Dispute.

Fifthly, The *Louvain* Divines, who (after *Hentenius*) reviewed the New Testament in 1574, understood this Matter as *Erasmus* did. For in their Corrected *Latin* Bible, and on this very Text of *St. John*, they declare, that † the Concurrence of the two Greek Copies, namely, the *British* and *Spanish* Copies, produced by *Erasmus*, is an Argument of the Genuineness of the said Text. In which Passage, as the *British* Copy was confessedly a Manuscript, so (by all Rules of Construction)

* Exemplar ex eadem, ni fallor, Bibliothecâ [sc. *Vaticana*] petittum secuti sunt Hispani. *Annotat. in locum.*

† Quod pro Textûs lectione facit, cui & Latinorum libri plurimi suffragantur, quibus consentientes duos Græcos Codices, unum *Britannicum*, alterum *Hispanicum*, *Erasmus* profert. *Apud Not. in N. T. Edit. Lovan. 1574, ad Epist. 1. Johan. c. 5. v. 7. [in Marg. Simonii de Version. Nov. Test. p. 107.]*

struction) must the *Spanish*, that is, the *Complutensian* Copy, be understood to be likewise a *Manuscript*, namely, the ancient *Vatican* MS. recommended to and used by the *Complutensian* Criticks, in their Edition of the New Testament, which (as was just now shewn) was allowed by *Erasmus* to have been followed by them.

And on this Occasion I cannot but take notice, that tho' *Lucas Brugensis* seems to Doubt whether the Semicircle placed by *Robert Stephens* after the Words *ἐν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, and not after the words *ἐν τῇ γῆ*, be rightly placed; yet the Concurrence of *Hentenius*, the Editor of the First *Louvain* Bible, in 1547, in placing the said little Semicircle, that is, the mark of Spurious Addition, immediately after the words *in Cælo*, and not after the words *in terrâ*, and this upon the Authority of several *Latin* MSS. This Agreement I say, in placing that Significant little Hook, by *Stephens* and *Hentenius*, is an Argument of some Weight to prove the Genuineness of our Disputed Verse, since *Stephens's* placing of it from *Greek* MSS. is confirm'd by the very same Placing of it by *Hentenius* from *Latin* MSS. and indeed this Coincidence is so Surprising, as to remove all Suspicion of Mistake in the placing of it by *R. Stephens*.

D Sixthly

Sixthly, F. *Amelote* of the Oratory, confessed by his Adversary F. *Simon* to be a Learned Man, and tho' Vain-glorious yet not false and dishonest; he, I say, assures us in his Notes on his own Version of the New Testament, that he himself had *seen* this Controverted Verse in the most *Ancient* MS. of the *Vatican* Library. If this Testimony of F. *Amelote* be not true, he was certainly one of the most egregious Lyars in the World; and if it be true, there is an End put to our present Dispute: Since then no doubt this was the very MS. that was sent by P. *Leo* to C. *Ximenes* as the Standard of his Edition of the New Testament. But this matter shall be farther considered in its proper Place, under one of the following Heads of this Discourse.

Seventhly, F. *Simon* himself, the most professed Adversary of our present Text, not only wishes that all the subsequent Editors had exactly followed the * *Complutensian* New Testament, which he owns to be the *First* Edition; but likewise acknowledges that the said Edition was taken from *Manuscripts*, and makes no question but that C. *Ximenes* consulted the most *Ancient* Copies of the New Testament

* See Crit. Hist. of the New Testament, Part II. E. Edit. p. 114. and p. 12. and p. 157.

Testament when he Published his Edition. In consequence of which Concession it appears, that F. *Simon* could not deny that this disputed Verse was taken by the *Complutensian* Editors from some Antient Manuscript, which is what the late Writers, who generally transcribe his Arguments against this Text, are not ingenuous enough to allow. And I cannot but take notice on this Occasion, that F. || *Simon* is so Frank as to acknowledge, that *Erasmus* had declared *he had seen a Greek Copy in England*, which obliged him to insert in his following Edition of the New Testament the disputed Passage of St. *John*. Which is another piece of Ingenuity of F. *Simon* not practiced by our present Adversaries, who are pleas'd to doubt whether *Erasmus* ever really saw such a Manuscript in *England*, tho' he himself says he had seen it; and tho' likewise he had owned * after his First Edition of the New Testament, that if he had met with one Copy that had the Disputed Verse, he would have inserted it; as accordingly he

D 2

|| Vid. Crit. Hist. p. 3.

* Quod si mihi contigisset unum Exemplar in quo fuisset quod nos legimus [sc. 1 *John* c. 5. v. 7.] nimirum illinc adiecissem quod in cæteris aberat.

Apud *Erasm* Respons. ad E. *Leum* p. 224. Tom. 9. Bas. 1540.

he did, when he found it in a *Greek Copy* in *England*, as he himself Acquaints us; and consequently must be allowed to have acted sincerely on that Occasion. And here we ought to reflect again, that the foreſaid Conceſſions of ſo zealous and learned an Adverſary as *F. Simon*, are of the greateſt weight even againſt his own profeſſed Opinion, with regard to the diſputed Paſſage in *St. John*.

Fourthly, Notwithſtanding the fore-mentioned Reaſons, it would very much Contribute to the Deciſion of the Preſent Controverſy about this Verſe in *St. John*, if the Original *Vatican* Manuſcript itſelf were again Conſulted, if it be ſtill Extant.

For tho' I cannot but think that the Reaſons now aſſigned carry an Air of great Probability, yet I am not ſo Bi-gotted to them, as to pretend they are abſolutely Deciſive in eſtabliſhing the Authority of this Text as derived from the *Vatican MS.* For as I aim at nothing but the Diſcovery of Truth on this Oc-caſion, it is acknowledged, that notwith-ſtanding the Order of *P. Leo* to the *Complutenſian* Editors not to depart from the moſt ancient *Vatican MS.* that he recommended to them, it is certain that he likewiſe ſent at the ſame time to them: ſome other antient MSS. no
doubt

doubt to be made use of by them in case of any considerable Defect in the fore-
said distinguished MS. And this is con-
fessed in other words by the Editors
themselves, when they tell us in their
Epistle to the Reader, * that several ve-
ry Antient and very Correct MSS. were
Communicated to them to form their
Edition upon as the Original Text. And
this is frankly owned by || Gomecius in
his Life of *Ximenes*, and by † Dr. Mill
himself. As for the Argument drawn
from the many *Singular* Readings of the
Complutensian New Testament, tho' it is
really a good one, yet it is not quite De-
cisive, nor does it irresistibly force our
Assent, because *Stunica*, ** one of the
Complutensian Editors, and who bore
a great Share in the trouble of Collat-
ing the *Vatican* MSS. as well as the *Rho-*
dian one, does not in exprefs words in-
form us any where, in his Dispute with
Erasmus, in what MS. he and the other
Editors found the 7th Verse, and whe-
ther particularly they inserted it in their
New

* — Complura Exemplaria impressioni huic Arche-
typæ fuisse antiquissima emendatissimaq;

— || Vid. Alv. Gomecium de vit. Ximen. lib. 2.
p. 966.

† Vid. Prolegom. p. 109.

** *Stunica* — cui haud exiguae in conferendis hisce
Codicibus partes erant. — Apud Mill. Prolegom.
p. 108.

New Testament from the *Vatican MS.* so eminently recommended to them by *P. Leo*. And since I scorn to use any Disguise in this Enquiry, it is confessed that tho' the Silence of *Stunica* does by no means overthrow the Argument drawn from the said *Singular Readings*, yet it is the greatest Difficulty to Account for, and what Sticks most with me. Again, *Erasmus's* Authority, as above cited, would have been Decretory, if he had spoken more expressly. And as for the *Louvain Divines*, they build their Assertion upon *Erasmus*, and indeed in their Notes in some subsequent Editions of their New Testament, do not seem to have been quite so frank in their Acknowledgement. And again, a greater Regard would be due to so Positive an Assertion as that of *F. Amelote*, if he had Pointed out the Number and Place of that most Antient MS. in the *Vatican Library* in which he saw this Disputed Verse, and had more plainly referred his Readers to it for their more entire Satisfaction.

Upon the whole therefore, it is highly Requisite that this celebrated *Vatican MS.* said to be the chief Standard of the First and Noblest Edition of the Greek Testament, be again Consulted, Reviewed, and Collated anew, if it be still in being, in order to Determine with greater Assurance

Assurance what Emendations were made of it by the other MSS. in forming the Text of the *Complutensian* New Testament, and consequently whether this Disputed Passage of St. *John* was actually in it, and taken from it into the Sacred Text.

Fifthly, In order to such a Review of the foresaid *Vatican* MS. it is necessary to Obviate a Mistake that has been committed by several Writers, in confounding the *Vatican* Greek MS. which is at the End of *Sixtus Quintus's* Bible, with that *Vatican* Greek MS. which was the Ground-work of the *Complutensian* New Testament.

It was asserted by *Erasmus* in his * Answers to *Lee* and *Stunica*, that the most ancient MS. of the *Vatican* Library has not the 7th Verse, and he gives us the very Words of *Paulus Bombasius* (the Collater of that MS.) in his Epistle to him to prove the same. F.

Mabillon

* Quid si comperiat eadem Lectio in Exemplari Bibliothecæ Pontificiæ? Ap. Respons. ad Letum. pag. 231. Vid. supra.—Codex vetustissimus in Bibliotheca Vaticana Summi Pontificis non habet testimonium triplex in Cælo.—nam Paulus Bombasius consulto Libro locum mihi descripsit ad Verbum.—Apud Apologiam ad Jac. Stunicam, p. 294. dist. Tom.—Vid. etiam P. Bombasii Epistolam inter Erasmi Epistolas, p. 756, 757. Edit. Lond.

Mabillon * likewise has taken Notice, that the Testimony of the three Witnesses in Heaven is wanting in the most ancient MS. of the *Vatican* Library; and as he adds expressly, in that MS. from which *Sixtus's* Septuagint was publish'd. Bishop || *Burnet* too, has acknowledg'd the same is not to be found in the most ancient *Vatican* MS. And not to mention any more, Mr. *Emlyn* † (the latest Writer against this Passage in *St. John*) has said the same after a great Number of Authors. And accordingly it has been imagin'd by Mr. *Emlyn* and many others, that this is the ancient MS. that was recommended by Pope *Leo*. Now all their Assertions that this Passage is not to be found in a *Vatican* MS. of great Antiquity are very true, if they are understood only of the very Ancient *Vatican* MS. which is at the End of *Sixtus Quintus's* Septuagint-Bible. But then they are foreign to our present Purpose; since it is very certain that the Ancient *Greek* MS. of the New Testament which is at the End of *Sixtus Quintus's* Bible, is not the MS. that was recommended by

* Vid. *Iter Italic.* Part. 1. Pag. 63, Par. 1687.

|| See Letter 1. p. 55. Amsterdam, 1686.

† See his *Enquiry*, p. 8 & 32.

by Pope *Leo* to the *Complutensian* Editors as the Standard of their Edition of the New Testament. For (as has been shewn before) the many *Singular* Readings in their Edition plainly evince that those Editors extracted them from some MS. very different from all the other MSS. that are now known, and consequently from that at the End of *Sixtus's* Septuagint. And if so, most probably they took them from that particular *Vatican* MS. which was recommended to them by *Leo* as the Text of their Edition. It is certain that the MS. styled by || Dr. *Mill* and others the *Codex Vaticanus* of great Antiquity is the Copy now extant at the End of *Sixtus's* Bible: And it is as certain that this MS. has not the *Singular* Readings that occur in the *Complutensian* Edition. And therefore this MS. is different from that which the *Complutensian* Editors made Use of by particular Order of *Leo* the 10th. This is very Agreeable to the Sentiments of the late learned Reviser of the New Testament Dr. *Mill*, who has made a just Distinction between these two ancient MSS. which seem to have been

E

taken by Others for one and the same. He assures us * that all the *Greek MSS.* excepting that of the Apostolical Epistles sent to *Ximenes* from *Rhodes*, were procur'd from the *Vatican Library*. Of which he particularly mentions two eminent *MSS.* The first, that which is now extant at the End of *Sixtus Quintus's Bible*, written in large Square or Uncial Characters, and said to be above 1200 Years Old. And to this *MS.* says he, no doubt these Editors had some Regard. But as for all the rest of the *Vatican MSS.* that *MS.* was most eminently distinguish'd, as he adds, which for its great Antiquity and Correctness, *Po Leo* sent as a Standard to the *Complutensian* Editors. As *Dr. Mill* || proves likewise afterwards by the many Singular Readings of that Edition, not to be found in any other *MS.* and therefore

* Cateri omnes Codices *MSS.* excepto sc. *Rhodio* Epistolarum Apostolicarum Cod. *MS.* & *Bibliotheca Vaticana* conquisiti sunt: iste certè in primis, qui extat jam ad finem Bibliorum Græcorum 12. m. 6. à *Sixto quinto* editus, & grandis ille, literisq; Quadratis sive Uncialibus, quas vocant, ante annos jam mille & ducentos, uti perhibent, exaratus. Hujus enim haud dubium est quin rationem habuerint Editores isti. Et reliquis erat insignis ille præ cæteris Codex, eximia Vetustatis, spectataq; fidei, quem tanquam Archetypum *Complutensibus* nostris tradidit *Leo decimus*. Apud *Prolegom.* p. 108. Edit. Oxon.

|| Vid. p. 109. *ibid.*

fore not in the Ancient MS. annex'd to Sixtus's Bible in the *Vatican* Library. By this just Distinction an End is effectually put to the vain Triumphs of the Adversaries of the 7th Verse: Those I mean, who by affirming that the said Verse is wanting in the most ancient MS. of the *Vatican* Library, have insinuated that there neither is, nor was formerly, a most Ancient MS. there that has, or had, that Text. This Distinction, as far as I can find, is what has never been consider'd in the Dispute now depending; and since it is of Importance, surely it deserves some farther Enquiry what is become of the latter *Greek* MS. on which the *Complutensian* New Testament was almost entirely form'd, and where that most valuable Copy is Lodg'd, that it may be again Consulted, as on other Occasions, so in a particular manner to clear up the Authority of this disputed Verse in *St. John*.

Sixthly, Since it is certain that the *Vatican* MS. was sent into *Spain* as the Ground-work of the *Complutensian* New Testament, and it is uncertain whether it was ever return'd from thence to the *Vatican* Library, if it is still extant it must lie conceal'd at this Time in the Archives of the *Complutensian*, or

E. 2 .mogsfor .AbiV some

some other *Spanish* Library; or if return'd to *Rome*, in the *Vatican* Archives. And Consequently, till an Accurate Search be made in those several Archives, the Dispute about the Authority of the foresaid Verse in *St. John* ought to be Suspended.

It is Confess'd indeed, that the learned Dr. *Mill* was of Opinion * that the fore-mention'd *Vatican* MS. was actually return'd to *Rome*, and lies now Conceal'd in the Archives of the *Vatican* Library, tho' probably distinguish'd there by its deserv'd peculiar Character. And this seems to be favour'd by F. *Amelote's* Assertion, as cited above. It must likewise be own'd, that the Supposition of its being sent back to *Rome* looks plausible enough, when we Consider that the *Vatican* MS. of the New Testament at the End of *Sixtus Quintus's* Septuagint - Bible was return'd from *Spain* to *Rome*, after it had been Collated by the *Complutensian* Editors. For we are assur'd by Dr. *Mill* that it was sent thither with other *Vatican* MSS. by *Pope Leo*; and it is very probable it was so sent, upon Account of its great Antiquity. Now it is certain that this very MS. was return'd to *Rome* by the Time

~~to the Archives of the Complutensian~~
~~in the Archives of the Complutensian~~

Vide *rolegom.* p 109.

Time of *Sixtus Quintus*, since *Carafa* by his Order Publish'd the Septuagint from that very MS. to the End of which the said Copy of the New Testament was Annex'd. If therefore Dr. *Mills*'s Supposition that the MS. used by *Sixtus Quintus* in his Edition of the LXX was actually sent to *C. Ximenes* in Spain be well-grounded, it is not improbable that the famous *Vatican* MS. which we are now in Search of, was sent back to *Rome* with the fore-mention'd LXX Bible, and the annex'd MS. of the New Testament. It is therefore highly expedient, that the Librarian of the *Vatican* should be consulted as soon as is possible, and the Archives of that Library be diligently Examined, in order to find out the *Greek* MS. that was prescrib'd to Cardinal *Ximenes* by Pope *Leo*, as the Basis of his Edition of the New Testament. Hither then we ought to recur for Satisfaction in the very first Place. And indeed we have had not long ago such an Instance of the Civility of the Court of *Rome* in the late Pope's Permission of the learned * Dr. *Wilkins*, to perfect his *Coptick* New Testament by the MSS. in the *Vatican* Library.

* Vid. Præfat. ad *Copticum* N. Testam. Oxon. 4to.

brary, that any Man of Learning is sufficiently encourag'd to make his Application on this Occasion, and especially in Vindication of the Honour of the Noble *Complutensian* Edition to which *P. Leo* so much Contributed.

But since, notwithstanding *Dr. Mill's* * warm way of expressing himself on this occasion, some Doubts may be rais'd whether the sending of the said MS. of the New Testament (at the end of *P. Sixtus's Bible*) to *Spain*, be any thing more than Conjectural; and if that were sent, whether the *Vatican MS.* which *Ximenes* chiefly used in his Edition of the New Testament might not be Detained there either Accidentally or in Vindication of the Authority of his said Edition, in order to be produced upon proper Occasions against any Objections of Innovation, tho' *Sixtus's MS.* were supposed to have been sent back to *Rome*, together with the other MSS. that were sent into *Spain*; these, I say, are Doubts that deserve some Consideration. For when we reflect on the State of things at *Rome*, a little before and after the Publication of the *Complutensian Bible*, such an Omission to send back to *Rome* the *Vatican MS.* chiefly used by the

* Vid. Prolegom. p. 109.

the *Complutensian* Editors, may be Accounted for. As it has been shewn before, that the *Complutensian* Bible was not Published till 1524, or rather 1525, and even then in some Confusion; so it ought to be recollected that *C. Ximenes*, the Editor of that great Work, Died in 1518, (according to * *Ciaconius*) and that *P. Leo* Dyed in 1521, and that the Successor of *Leo*, namely, *Adrian* the 6th not only had no great Genius for Critical Learning, and was wholly taken up with Schemes of Reforming Abuses in the Church, but ** Died within less than two Years from his Elevation to the Papal Chair; and likewise that the Successors of *Adrian*, in a long train, had little Inclination to Learning, or after so long a time might easily have forgot to Demand back any of the MSS. that were sent to *Ximenes*; these Circumstances, I say, being Consider'd, it appears by no means improbable, that the foresaid *Vatican* MS. and perhaps Others sent from *Rome*, were never Returned to the *Vatican* Library, but were either left among the Books and Papers of *Ximenes* at *Toledo* upon his Decease, or among the MSS. that he himself bought for Carrying on his

* Vid. Vit. Pontific. Rom. p. 1381. Vol. II. Rom. 1630.

** Vid. *Ciaconium*, in Vit. *Adrian*.

his Edition of the Bible, and left in the Library which he gave to his newly erected University at *Complutum* or *Alcala de Henares*, where that Primitive Edition was begun and Perfected.

But to Consider the State of things at Rome a little farther, it does not appear from the Lives of the following Popes, that is, from the Death of *Leo* the 10th till the Reign of *Urban* the 8th, which is about the Space of One Hundred Years, that any Design was carried on at Rome that required the Review or Examination of any of the *Vatican MSS.* of the New Testament that had been sent by *Leo* to *Ximenes*, excepting that at the End of *Sixtus's* Septuagint, which perhaps was never sent into Spain. For tho' the Popes *Pius* 4th and 5th are said to have Projected a New Edition of the Vulgar Latin Version, which *Sixtus* the 5th Carried on, as well as Order'd the Edition of the Septuagint by *Carafa*; and tho' *Clement* the 8th Reformed the Roman Edition of the Vulgar Latin; yet nothing appears to have been done at Rome with regard to the Greek Text of the New Testament, that required a Survey of the *Vatican MSS.* from the time of *Leo* the 10th till *Urban* the 8th. And therefore

* Vid. Ciaconium, p. 1825. Part II.

therefore in the Space of an whole Century, it might easily happen that the foresaid *Vatican* MS. and perhaps some Others might be forgot to be Demanded back again to *Rome*. And that the *Vatican* MS. so particularly recommended to *Ximenes*, was not Returned to *Rome* by the time of *Urban* the 8th, appears Credible from hence, that * when by that Pope's Command there was a Review made of the *Greek* MSS. of the New Testament at *Rome* by *Matt. Caryophilus*, in order to carry on a New Edition of the same at that Place, and when he Collated (besides those of the Gospels) Eight *Greek* MSS. of the Epistles; MSS. of the greatest Antiquity in the *Vatican* and the other Principal Libraries in *Rome*; the Disputed Verse of *St. John* was not to be found in any of them, as has been already intimated in this Discourse. But tho' the Suppression of that designed Edition be to this day a Secret, yet it appears that the *Vatican* MS. which was the Groundwork of the *Complutensian* Edition was not then at *Rome*. And if not then at *Rome*, it is not very probable that it has been sent thither since, and is there now; and more

F

especi-

* Vid. Catenam in Marc. Pet. Possinum, p. 522, 523. Romæ. 1673. Vid. etiam Præfat.

especially when we consider that tho' those Various Readings that were Collected by *Caryophilus* have been since Published by *P. Possinus*, the Design of another Review has not been since revived. We might have hoped for some Light in this matter from some good Catalogue of the MSS. of the *Vatican Library* since the Reign of *Leo* the 10th. But there is no such Printed Catalogue to be found, nor indeed any Other but the imperfect one of *Possevine*, † in which there is no mention made of any *Greek MSS.* of the New Testament. It is certain from *Spizelius*, who Published his *Arcana Bibliothecarum illustr. detecta*, in 1668, that there was then no Catalogue Published of the *Vatican MSS.* but that of *Possevine*, whose Catalogue he has Reprinted. As for ‖ *Alexander Raynaldus*, after *Possevine*, he seems only to have been concerned in drawing up a Catalogue of the *Latin MSS.* in the *Vatican Library*: which, however, is not yet Published. And perhaps the true reason of its not being Published is, that the § Poverty of the *Vatican Library* with regard even to Ancient *Latin MSS.* and that too after the Accession of the
Pala-

† Vid. *Possevini Apparat. Sacr.*
 ‖ Vid. *Leon. Allatij Apes Urban. & Alibi*,
 § Vid. *Burnet's Letters*. p. 227.

Palatine and other Libraries to it, made it necessary to Suppress the said Catalogue, in order to preserve the Reputation of the *Vatican* Library. If any thing of this nature with regard either to *Greek* or *Latin* MSS. in the *Vatican* Library, is to be met with among us, we must recur for it to a Curious Gentleman that Resides not far from *Windsor*; who, according to credible Fame has by him more exact Catalogues of the MSS. of the *Vatican* and other Eminent Libraries abroad, than have yet been Published. He would therefore oblige the Learned Word, if he would please to Communicate to it some Account of those MSS. and more especially, with regard to the Subject of the Present Enquiry, if he would bestow upon the Publick what Catalogues he may have happen'd to be favour'd with of the MSS. of the *Vatican*, *Escorial*, *Toledo*, or *Alcala* Libraries. He will, I hope, pardon the Liberty of this Application from one who is entirely a Stranger to him; since it is occasioned by an Enquiry that may be Beneficial to the Learned World.

In the mean time with relation to the *Escorial* Library, it does not appear from the Collation of Eight *Greek* MSS. of that Library by * *Petrus Faxardus* that

F. 2

this

* Vid. De la Cerda Adversar. p. 129. Lugd. 1616.

this Disputed Passage of St. *John* was in any of them. I cannot find that there is any Catalogue of the *Eſcurial* MSS. as yet Published but that of * *Barvoëtius*, which is too imperfect to give us an Account of the MSS. of the *Greek* Testament, as having been made only by Help of Memory. And in the Description of that Library by † *Claudius Clements*, no Account is to be met with of any *Greek* MS. of the New Testament that is above 600 Years old. But indeed an End is put for ever to this Enquiry into the MSS. of the *Eſcurial* Library, if ‖ *F. Montfaucon's* Account be true, namely, that the numerous and most Antient MSS. of that Library are all Destroy'd by Fire.

As for the other Libraries in *Spain*, in which the fore-mentioned, *Vatican* MS. may probably be thought to lye Concealed ever since it was used by *C. Ximenes*, they are those of *Complutum* or *Alcala*, and *Toledo*. Concerning either of which I confess I can meet with but slender

* Vid. Barvoëtii Catalogum præfix. Cyrilli Alex. Homilii in Jeremiam editis Gr. & Lat. per Corderium. Antv. 1648. 8vo. & apud Labb. Biblioth. Nov. p. 175. Par. 1653. 4to.

† Vid. Claud. Clement. Biblioth. Eſcurial. Descript. c. 4. p. 528, &c. Lugd. 1635. 4to.

‖ Vid. Palæograph. Græc. p. 28.

der Accounts. † But since *Ximenes* was the Founder of the University of *Alcala*, and settled Professors there; since his Celebrated Edition of the Old and New Testament was begun, carry'd on, and finish'd at *Alcala* by Seven very learned Persons that were assembled by him at that Place; since we are assur'd that the Seven *Hebrew* Copies, with which the Old Testament was Collated, are actually now at *Alcala*, or were so when *Gomecius* wrote his History of *Ximenes*; and lastly, since we are inform'd by * a very learned and competent Judge of these Matters that the *Complutensian* or *Alcala* Library was filled with all Sorts of Books, and with those of Divinity in an extraordinary Manner by *Ximenes* himself, and that this Library is styled *Wonderful* and *Singular*, and is recommended especially on Account of the *Bibles* contain'd in it; when all this, I say, is put together, it is by no Means improbable that the *Vatican* MS. so particularly used by *Ximenes* at *Alcala*, was lodg'd there with his own MSS. of the Bible, and in the fore-

† Vid. Alv. Gomecium de gestis Ximenii, l. 2. p. 966.

* Vid. De la Cerda de Appar. Lat. Sermon. apud A. Schotti Hispaniæ Bibliothec. p. 61, 62. Francof. 1608. 4to.

fore-mention'd Hurry and Confusion occasion'd by the Death both of *Ximenes* and *Leo* (before the Publication of the long-suppress'd *Complutensian* Edition of the Old and New Testament) may never have been return'd back to *Rome*. And consequently, since the said MS. may lye there Conceal'd to this Day, the Library at *Alcala* well deserves to be nicely examin'd by some learned Person, upon supposition that by a Previous Search it is not to be found in the *Vatican* Library.

With regard to *Toledo*, we are assured by the fore-mention'd * Writer of the Life of *Ximenes*, that there is a Volume of Letters wrote by *Ximenes* now extant in MS. in the Archives of the Church of *Toledo*; a few of which Letters are inserted by *Gomecius* in his said Life. Now these MSS. Letters of *Ximenes*, if consulted, may possibly give some Light to the Question what became of the *Vatican* MS. that we are now enquiring after, when *Ximenes* had Perfection'd his Edition of the New Testament. For it is certain, that *Ximenes* lived one Year after that great Work was Finish'd. For the whole Bible was begun

• Vid. Lib. 4.

begun in 1502, and finish'd in 15 Years,
 that is, in 1517, the famous Era of
Luther's Reformation. And, as has
 been shewn before, *Ximenes* Died in
 1518. Indeed it is not improbable that
 the said *Vatican* MS. may have acciden-
 tally been deposited in the Archives of
 that Church in which *Ximenes* Presided
 as Primate, when he Died, and in which
 are actually found his unpublish'd Let-
 ters and Papers; with which that MS.
 we are in Search of might easily
 be Convey'd, and lye there Undis-
 turb'd to this Day. It is therefore
 worth farther Enquiry into those Un-
 publish'd Letters of *Ximenes*, and the
 other Papers and Books in the Archives
 of *Toledo*, in order to discover the
 most Valuable *Vatican* MS. And that
 such an Examination of the *Spanish*
 Archives is Practicable at this Time,
 and especially by procuring a particu-
 lar Order of the Government there for
 that End, the Present Peace with *Spain*,
 and the late renewing a friendly Com-
 merce with that Nation, seem to per-
 swade us; if the Bigottry that too
 much prevails there be not an insu-
 perable Obstacle to all Enquiries of this
 Nature.

To Conclude, as you are engag'd,
 Mr. Archdeacon, in giving the World
 a New

a New Edition of the *Greek Testament*, and as you are known to have employ'd some learned Persons Abroad in the Collation of MSS. on that Occasion; so may it be justly expected that you will depute some Persons of Learning, to Examine more nicely than ever the Archives of the *Vatican* and the fore-mention'd *Spanish* Libraries, in order to find out and (if it be still in being) to Collate anew the famous *Vatican MS.* that was the ground-work of the First and Noblest Edition of the *Greek Testament*. And indeed such a Discovery, and subsequent Collation, of so Valuable a MS. would be a very Advantageous Distinction of your Design'd Edition. For how ancient soever those four *Greek MSS.* may be whose Collations you promise in your New Edition, (whether some of them be those of *Kuster* * or Distinct ones) and which possibly were Unknown to the late industrious Reviser *Dr. Mill*, yet it must add highly to your Honour, and that of your Work, if you shall be so Happy as to Discover and Collate that most Ancient MS. on which not only the learned Doctor but *Pope Leo* and the *Complutensian* Editors laid so great a Stress.

How
~~the World will give in necessity~~
 * Mid: Pref. to *Kuster's* Edit. of *Mill's Gr. T.*

How false a Judgment soever has been made by some Criticks with regard to the multitude of *Various Readings* in the New Testament, you have the Wishes of all Competent Judges that you could discover many more *Greek MSS.* of it of great Antiquity, and oblige the World with their Collations. But without derogating from the Value of your lately Discover'd *Greek MSS.* or any Others that may be Retriev'd, it must be granted that none can be more Decisive in the Dispute now depending about the Authority of the fore-mention'd Passage of *St. John*, than the confessedly most Ancient *Vatican MS.* from which so many *Singular Readings* seem to have been Copied into the *Complutensian Edition*, and from thence were transcrib'd into the most eminent Subsequent Editions of the New Testament, in an entire Dependence on the great Antiquity and Correctness of that MS.

And indeed, Sir, besides these general Reasons for making a strict Enquiry after the *Vatican MS.* there seems to be a particular Reason or two for your giving Orders to some well-qualify'd Persons to search for, and (if it be extant) to Collate that Copy. One Reason is, because it is Obvious that your

G

Edition

Edition of the Greek Testament is design'd to Outshine that of Dr. Mill. But, as he acquiesced in a mere Conjecture that the foresaid *Vatican* MS. lies conceal'd at this Time in the Archives of the *Vatican* Library; how will your Edition excel his in this Respect, if you do not exert your self with greater Vigour, in endeavouring to Discover and Collate so Venerable a Copy of the New Testament? Another Reason is, that you are Cited by profess'd * *Arian* Writers, as one that is of Opinion that the Controverted Passage in *St. John* is Spurious. Now as this Declaration of Opinion, previous to the Collation of several MSS. is no small Prejudice to your design'd Edition, so one of the Methods that seem necessary to be used in order to Vindicate your self from the Imputation of Partiality and Prepossession, seems to be that Critical Examination of the *Vatican* and *Spanish* Libraries which is here propos'd, to find out and Collate anew the most Ancient *Vatican* MS. which is so justly presum'd to have in it the fore-mention'd Passage of *St. John*. The last Reason

* See Emlyn's Reply to Martin, p. 43. and Whiston's Answer to the Earl of Nottingham, p. 106.

son I shall assign is, that however Expensive such an Examination of the foresaid Libraries may be pretended to be, it is generally believ'd you have already receiv'd so large a Sum of Money, either in the Way of Bounty or Subscription, as will very amply support the Expences of the propos'd Examination.

Upon the Whole, if it shall appear from the *Vatican* MS. when retriev'd, that the *Complutensian* Editors inserted the disputed Passage of St. *John* from that most Ancient Copy, an End will be put effectually to the Insults of the Adversaries of that Passage. And if it cannot be Discover'd, but must be given up for a Lost or Perish'd Copy, yet still the strong Probabilities will continue that the *Complutensian* Editors inserted the said Passage from it. However, it is very just and reasonable that the Controversy about this Passage should be Suspended, till the greatest Diligence possible be used to find out the Celebrated *Vatican* MS. And then it will be Time enough to Decide upon the Authority of this Passage. In the mean Time, as the Method proposed by yourself, Sir, of endeavouring to find out whether the said Passage be genuine or

not by an accurate Collation of the most Antient *Latin* MSS. of the New Testament, as supposed to be Translated from the most Ancient Uncorrupt *Greek* Copies ; as this Consequential Method, I say, is Subsidiary, and may Contribute to give some New Light in this Dispute, (tho' it cannot be allow'd to be a Decisive Argument) so is it highly Probable that it is a Method that will be serviceable towards the Establishment of this Passage of *St. John*. For far the greater Number of those *Latin* MSS. that have been hitherto Collated by learned Men retain this Passage ; and many of them no Doubt are very Ancient. Whatever be the Result of Collating your own *Latin* MSS. asserted by you to be very Antient, the Publick will be glad to be inform'd of it. For tho' it should happen that they want this Passage, their Authority will not be Conclusive against that of a Multitude of Other very Antient *Latin* MSS. that are known to Retain it.

On the other Side, if it shall appear from the *Vatican* MS. when retriev'd, that the *Complutensian* Editors did not insert the Disputed Passage of *St. John* from that most Ancient Copy, but
from

from *Latin* Copies of great Antiquity; tho' such a Discovery would confute the Reasons assign'd in this Discourse, yet agreeably to the Method proposed by your self, Sir, of finding out the Genuine *Greek* Text by the Concurrence of very Ancient *Latin* Copies that were Translated from the most Antient and Uncorrupt *Greek* MSS. I say, upon this Principle, neither the Reputation of the *Complutensian* Edition of the *Greek* Testament, nor the Authority of this Controverted Text in particular, would be affected by such a Discovery. For if *Stunica* and his Brethren were perswaded that most, if not all, the *Greek* MSS. of *St. John* that are now Extant, were Corrupted, and that the *Latin* Copies that retain this Controverted Passage were agreeable to the most Ancient Uncorrupted *Greek* Copies, and that consequently this Passage ought justly to be inserted in that Edition, as in Fact it was; I do not see why they ought to undergo any Censure from your self, who pay so great a Regard to, and lay so mighty a Stress upon the Ancient *Latin* Copies of the New Testament, whatever Opinion the rest of the learned World might on
this

this Occasion entertain, by way of Dis-
minution, of the Authority of the Com-
plutensian Editors.

I am,

Reverend S I R,

Your most humble Servant.

F I N I S

E R R A T A.

pag. 99. l. 7. dele *Comma* after *Publisch'd.* p. 11. l. 16.
read 1546: p. 20. l. 4. in *Marg. r. sanctus.* p. 24. l. 19.
i. *Henricus.* p. 28. l. 11. r. notwithstanding. p. 33. l. 9.
after consequently i. *not.*
justly to be inserted in that Edition,
as it had it was; I do not see why
they ought to undergo any Censure
from your self, who pay so great a
Regard to, and lay so mighty a Stress
upon the Ancient Latin Copies of the
New Testament, whatever Opinion the
rest of the learned World might on
this